

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in reply to the final Office Action dated March 21, 2006, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-12 are presently pending in the application. With this Amendment, the specification and claims 1, 11 and 12 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of this Amendment. Thus, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. Objections To Specification

The specification was objected to for minor informalities (i.e., embedded hyperlinks). Accordingly, the Applicants have herein amended the specification to remove the executable hyperlinks, as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objections to the specification are now respectfully requested.

II. §101 Rejections To Claims

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Accordingly, the Applicants have herein amended claim 12 to recite a *program having executable code stored on a computer-readable medium that when executed by one or more processors performs a series of steps*. The amendments made to claim 12 are believed to be in complete conformance with MPEP §2106 and the suggestions made by the Examiner. As such, the Applicants respectfully request that the §101 rejection to claim 12 be withdrawn.

III. §103 Rejections To Claims

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lennox et al. ("A Language for User Control of Internet Telephony Services, hereafter "Lennox") in view of Moshfeghi (U.S. Patent No. 6,467,833, hereafter "Moshfeghi"). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the following reasons.

To expedite prosecution, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 11 and 12 to further distinguish over the prior art of record. More specifically, the claims have been amended to point out that the data processing system is used as a function of authorization in Internet Telephony. The claims have also been amended to point out that the specific instructions are received in an Internet Markup Language and parsed using a parser. An important aspect of the invention is that the specific instructions received are not executed unless

it is first determined that a user has the basic authorization to do so. The cited art, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest these features, and these features are clearly supported by the Applicants' disclosure (see, Applicants' application, page 5, lines 5-15).

Lennox teaches various call processing language (CPL) script arrangements for call processing (see sections 2.1-2.3, pages 2-4). Although, Lennox teaches or suggests a CPL for the description and control of Internet telephony services, nowhere does it teach or suggest that priority and authorization levels of a user are determined prior to execution of the CPL. In other words, the Examiner has identified different sections of Lennox (e.g., 6.2-7.1), which describe the operation and function of the CPL. In particular, the Examiner relies on the description of the CPL directed to location look-up, location removal and proxy functions. Additionally, it appears that Examiner relies on the CPL itself as the claimed "specific instructions."

However, these functions clearly require the execution of the processing language (i.e., CPL) for their performance (e.g., location look-up, location removal and proxy functions). In contrast, in the present invention, when specific instructions are received (e.g., which may include CPL), authorization and priority for execution of these instructions is determined. As seen in Fig. 2, the basic definition file 16 and the priority definition file 18 are used by the parser 12 to determine authorization of a user to execute the instructions. If a user has the basic authorization, then the specific instructions can be executed. Thus, in the present invention, the authorization of a user is determined prior to execution of the instructions. As noted above, Lennox neither teaches nor suggests this type of authorization prior to execution of the CPL (i.e., specific instructions).

Furthermore, Moshfeghi does not overcome the deficiencies noted above in Lennox. Thus, even if it were appropriate to combine the teachings of Lennox and Moshfeghi, the combination still would not teach or suggest all the features recited in at least independent claims 1, 11 and 12.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 11 and 12 are now believed to be distinguishable over the prior art of record. Additionally, dependent claims 2-10 are also believed to be distinguishable over the prior art of record based on their dependency from independent claim 1.

IV. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that all the claims are novel and non-obvious over the cited prior art, and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any additional fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Director is authorized to deduct such fees from deposit account no. 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket no. (0112740-360) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Peter Zura

Reg. No. 48,196

Customer No.: 29177

Phone: (312) 807-4208

Dated: June 20, 2006